

### REMARKS

Claims 1-10 and 13-45 remain in the present application. Claims 1-10, 14-41 and 43-44 are amended herein. Claim 45 is added herein. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added as a result of the claim amendments. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration of the rejections based on the arguments set forth below.

### Examiner Interview Summary

A telephonic examiner interview was conducted on October 8, 2008 between Examiner Gregory Vaughn and Applicants' representatives Bryan M. Failing and Glenn D. Barnes. Independent Claim 1 was discussed with respect to the Sadovnik, Reamey and McGarry references. It was agreed that Sadovnik, Reamey and McGarry, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest displaying different portions of a spreadsheet object on respective display screens of a multi-component display as claimed. Additionally, the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection was discussed, and it was agreed that the specification as filed provides support for a multi-component display comprising a first and second display screen as claimed. Applicants thank the Examiner for granting the interview.

### Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-10 and 13-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. As discussed during the Examiner Interview on October 8, 2008, the specification as

filed describes a display device with multiple components (e.g., a first display screen and a second display screen as described in, for example, lines 3-16 of page 4). Accordingly, as agreed during the Examiner Interview, Applicants respectfully submit that the specification as filed provides support for a multi-component display as claimed. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-10 and 13-44 overcome the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection of record.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-10, 13-33, 35-38 and 40-44

Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-10, 13-33, 35-38 and 40-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Number 5,764,317 to Sadovnik et al. (hereafter referred to as “Sadovnik”) in view of United States Patent Number 5,113,272 to Reamey (hereafter referred to as “Reamey”) and further in view of United States Patent Number 6,859,907 to McGarry (hereafter referred to as “McGarry”). Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-10, 13-33, 35-38 and 40-44 are not rendered obvious by Sadovnik in view of Reamey and further in view of McGarry for at least the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to independent Claim 1 that recites one disclosed embodiment related to a method of displaying spreadsheet objects comprising (emphasis added):

assigning a first screen designation code to a first portion of a spreadsheet object, said first screen designation code associated with a first display screen of a multi-component display;

assigning a second screen designation code to a second portion of said spreadsheet object, said second screen designation code associated with a second display screen of said multi-component display; and simultaneously displaying said first and second portions of said spreadsheet object in accordance with said first and second screen designation codes, wherein said simultaneously displaying further comprises simultaneously displaying said first and second portions of said spreadsheet object on a respective display screen of said first and second display screens, wherein said simultaneously displaying comprises generating said first and second portions of said spreadsheet object using at least one pixel of said first display screen and at least one pixel of said second display screen.

Independent Claims 18 and 31 recite limitations similar to independent Claim 1. Claims 2, 4-7, 9-10, 13-17, 19-30, 32-33, 35-38 and 40-44 depend from their respective independent Claims and recite further limitations to the claimed invention.

It was agreed during the Examiner Interview that Sadovnik, Reamey and McGarry, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest displaying different portions of a spreadsheet object on respective display screens of a multi-component display. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Sadovnik, Reamey and McGarry, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the combination of features, including, for example, "wherein said simultaneously displaying further comprises simultaneously displaying said first and second portions of said spreadsheet object on a respective display screen of said first and second display screens" as recited in independent Claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that independent Claim 1 is not rendered obvious by Sadovnik in view of Reamey and further in view of McGarry, thereby overcoming the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of record.

Since independent Claims 18 and 31 recite limitations similar to those of independent Claim 1, independent Claims 18 and 31 also overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of record. Since dependent Claims 2, 4-7, 9-10, 13-17, 19-30, 32-33, 35-38 and 40-44 recite further limitations to the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, dependent Claims 2, 4-7, 9-10, 13-17, 19-30, 32-33, 35-38 and 40-44 are also not rendered obvious by Sadovnik in view of Reamey and further in view of McGarry. Since dependent Claim 45 recites further limitations to the invention claimed in independent Claim 1, dependent Claim 45 is also not rendered obvious by Sadovnik in view of Reamey and further in view of McGarry. Therefore, Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-10, 13-33, 35-38 and 40-45 are allowable.

#### Claims 3, 8, 34 and 39

Claims 3, 8, 34 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sadovnik in view of Reamey further in view of McGarry and further yet in view of "Mastering Microsoft Office 2000 Professional Edition" by Courter et al (hereafter referred to as "Courter"). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 3, 8, 34 and 39 are not rendered obvious by Sadovnik in view of Reamey further in view of McGarry and further yet in view of Courter for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that Courter, either alone or in combination with Sadovnik, Reamey and/or McGarry, fails to cure the deficiencies of the

Sadovnik/Reamey/McGarry combination discussed above with respect to independent Claim 1. Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that Courter also fails to teach or suggest the combination of features, including, for example, "wherein said simultaneously displaying further comprises simultaneously displaying said first and second portions of said spreadsheet object on a respective display screen of said first and second display screens" as recited in independent Claim 1, and similarly recited in independent Claim 31. Consequently, since Claims 3, 8, 34 and 39 recite further limitations to the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, Claims 3, 8, 34 and 39 are not rendered obvious by Sadovnik in view of Reamey further in view of McGarry and further yet in view of Courter. Thus, Claims 3, 8, 34 and 39 overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of record, and are therefore allowable.

#### General Remarks

The additional limitations recited in the independent claims or dependent claims are not further discussed as the above-discussed limitations are believed to be sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art of record. However, Applicants respectfully reserve the right to respond to one or more of the Examiner's rejections in subsequent amendments should conditions arise warranting such responses.

### CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-10 and 13-45 are in condition for allowance and Applicants earnestly solicit such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP

Dated: 11 / 4 / 2008

/BMF/

Bryan M. Failing  
Registration No. 57,974

Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
(408) 938-9060